

Some Questions For the Ring.

Those opposed to F. J. Hall for the office of sheriff make the charge that he is not capable of conducting the office but fail to show wherein he has failed to fulfill all the requirements.

If they have any proofs let them produce them.

On the other hand, they make the assertion that Edwards is better fitted to fill the office than Hall, yet his past performances do not indicate that he is in any way a better man.

Of what has Peyton Edwards ever made a success?

Let them answer that.

It is not required of a sheriff that he be in his office all hours of the day.

Ask Park Pittman if in taking the oath of county clerk there was a reservation made that he could go to Kentucky for a month or two every year?

Who runs his office?

Let them answer these questions if they can.

AMUSEMENTS.

THE AIRDOME.

The fourth review of a "Fictitious Nobleman" was greeted with a well filled house at the Airdome last night, and judging from the numerous rounds of applause given the different members of the cast and chorus it was clearly evident that the show had made a hit.

Chas. LaRoe received numerous encores on his rendition of the song "Keep Your Foot on the Soft Pedal." Mr. DeVere's solo, "I wish I had a Girl" was a decided treat. Mr. DeVere is possessed of a splendid baritone voice and knows how to use it. Edmund Flynn's interpretation of the "French Count" is a splendid bit of characterization and his technique and acting are deserving of the liberal applause accorded him.

The most enjoyable and laughable scene in the bill is the "mysterious hostility bet." Miss Adler's lightning change and disposition of the red and blue stockings is not only a surprise but a mystifying trick. Miss Josephine Medville as the poor old maid gave a good portrayal of the character.

Miss Lilian Shattuck sang in splendid voice and was a feature.

The chorus is by far the prettiest and merriest manager Rich has ever assembled.

The bill continues for the balance of the week.

THE BIJOU.

"The Antioch Sacrifice" succeeded in pleasing large crowds at the Bijou last night, and deservedly so, showing as it does the early days of Mexico in the reign of the Emperor Montezuma, and the conquest by Cortes. The parts are well taken and the surroundings true to Prescott's history of the "Conquest of Mexico." This picture will be shown for the last time tonight.

"Fend," a Viareggio comedy-drama, will also be included in tonight's offering.

To Eradicate Skin Rashes

Skin rashes or redness that appear on your face, hands, arms, legs, back or body should be treated at once with Little's Liquid Sulphur Compound. Not only are they bad themselves, but become a source of worry and discomfort. Unless you've had Eczema you can't conceive of the horrible itching, burning, maddening pain. Whether you're fast at the beginning or far along in your suffering Little's Liquid Sulphur Compound will stop all itching instantly and eradicate the disease by penetrating the pores and killing all germs. Best treatment for skin diseases—Eczema, rashes, pimples, sores, hives, prickly heat, etc. Sample bottle sent postpaid for 10c. Rhuma-Sulphur Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Mallory Line

Between Galveston, Key West and New York

Superior Passenger Accommodations

Fast Freight Service

STEAMERS SAIL EVERY WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY AT NOON

Wednesday Steamers Call at Key West, Fla., making connection for points in Florida and Cuba.

Saturday Steamers Carry Freight Only

For particulars as to reservations, rates, etc., see your ticket agent or write

S. T. DeMILT,

Gen. Agent, Galveston, Texas.

Tickets to and from Europe

Where to buy hay, oats, grain, etc., etc. This question is satisfactorily settled if you decide to favor us with your orders. We carry a large stock on hand which assures prompt delivery. Also headquarters for fresh field, garden and flower seeds.

O. G. SEETON & SON,

Third and Chihuahua Sts.

Where to buy hay, oats, grain, etc., etc. This question is satisfactorily settled if you decide to favor us with your orders. We carry a large stock on hand which assures prompt delivery. Also headquarters for fresh field, garden and flower seeds.

O. G. SEETON & SON,

Third and Chihuahua Sts.

Where to buy hay, oats, grain, etc., etc. This question is satisfactorily settled if you decide to favor us with your orders. We carry a large stock on hand which assures prompt delivery. Also headquarters for fresh field, garden and flower seeds.

O. G. SEETON & SON,

Third and Chihuahua Sts.

RAILROAD NEWS. RAILWAY BRIDGE SET ON FIRE?

G. H. Board of Inquiry Decides That Incendiarism Caused Damage.

That the railroad bridge on the G. H. railroad near Bean station was destroyed by fire of an incendiary origin, is the conclusion arrived at by a board of inquiry, which convened on July 13, the day following the destruction of the bridge at the scene of the destroyed structure.

There was evidence tending to show that the bridge caught fire in the middle, and inasmuch as the engines used on the El Paso division are oil burners, the possibility of the bridge having caught fire from coals was eliminated.

Possibility of it having caught from dropping oil was also discounted by the fact that supervisor of bridges Taylor of the G. H. and the roadmaster were sitting on the rear end of the last train which passed over the bridge before the fire being on a trip of inspection would have seen the fire in its inception.

The report of the board of inquiry stops at stating its belief that the fire was of incendiary origin, leaving it to officers of the law by whom the investigation is being conducted, to fix responsibility for the criminal act.

WASHOUT DERAILS S. P. FREIGHT TRAIN

Another Train Narrowly Escapes—Nogales-Tucson Cutoff in Use.

Nogales, Ariz., July 21.—An S. P. freight train between Nogales and Benson was derailed on account of a washout, making it necessary for trains to go over the Tucson-Nogales cutoff. No serious loss was incurred and the train crew escaped injury.

Another train just escaped a wall of water 12 feet high, which swept down a canyon on the Benson-Nogales road.

The washouts near Magdalena have been repaired and trains on the Sonora division are running on regular schedule.

RAILROAD EARNINGS SHOW GREAT DECREASE.

Expert States That Trackage and Terminal Facilities Need Repair and That Interest on Loans Has Increased.

A prescription for the cure of the "present anti-railroad fever" is given in a pamphlet being sent out over the country by the railroads. The paper was written by A. G. Griffin, of the Griffin Wheel company. Citing the dependency of the public on the prosperity of railroads, he states there are 5,500,000 railway employees and it takes 2,500,000 men to supply what the railroads need and a vast number of men to supply the personal needs of the 4,000,000 people and their families representing 14,000,000 people.

The net earnings of the railroads north and west of a line drawn from Chicago to St. Louis show a decrease of \$2,500,000 for the nine months ended 3rd Feb. 1910, and a decrease for the month of March of \$965,000 he states. Additional to this, the report says the taxes of these roads were increased \$2,500,000 over the previous year and the rate of interest on loans has increased. The railroads need \$2,000,000,000 for track improvement and \$1,000,000,000 for terminal improvements, and the writer states that this money can only be had from increased earnings from advanced rates, which Mr. Griffin says could easily be absorbed by the manufacturer, the jobber and the retailer.

CAR REPAIRERS OF THE SOUTHWEST HOLD MEETING

The joint association of car inspectors, representing railroads of the southwest, held its semi-annual meeting Wednesday afternoon at 2 o'clock in the old Southwest building on north Campbell street and discussed questions of interest to car repairers.

Those present were Tom Paxson, superintendent of motive power of the Southwest; W. Russell, foreman of car repairers of the G. H.; Pat Powers, general car inspector of the Santa Fe; E. B. Smith, terminal superintendent of the Texas & Pacific; and J. D. O'Connor, foreman of car repairers of the Mexican National railways, with headquarters at Chihuahua.

FORMER EL PASO POSTAL CLERK WEDS

Announcements of the marriage on July 11, at Harwell, Tex., of Harry T. Patchin to Miss Olga Hyatt, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. C. Hyatt of El Paso, have been received in El Paso city by friends of Mr. Patchin, who was formerly in the railway mail service, running out of El Paso on the Southwest. He is now the Amarillo-Albuquerque run, and their home will be in Albuquerque.

LARGE EQUIPMENT FOR MEXICAN ROADS ORDERED.

Mexico City, Mex., July 21.—To meet the requirements of the increasing traffic, the National Railways of Mexico have placed an order for new equipment amounting to \$4,000,000 gold. This is the largest order of the kind that is being sent out of Mexico. It calls for 20 Mallet locomotives of the heaviest type, baggage and express cars and 3200 freight cars.

ABOUT RAILROAD PEOPLE.

H. W. McCool, formerly head transfer clerk of the railway mail service at the union station, has been promoted to the position of assistant chief clerk in the office of chief clerk McKnight in the federal building.

Ben Carroll, postal clerk between El Paso and Big Springs, is spending his vacation with his parents in east Texas.

J. W. Hill, railway mail clerk between El Paso and Benson, is laying off from his duties on account of illness at his home, on Tulare street.

Richard Warren, general agent of the southwestern, 111 R. R. Seeds, traveling freight and passenger agent of the Rock Island, returned from Chihuahua, Wednesday.

Jack Powers, formerly trip track foreman of the Santa Fe at El Paso, has been promoted to the position of general car foreman at Deming, N. M., and has left the city to take up his duties there.

F. C. Tays, car inspector for the S. F. at Deming, is in the city Thursday.

Assistant superintendent Hoover of the G. H. returned Thursday morning from Del Rio and Sanderson.

USE ALLEN'S FOOT-EASE.

The antiseptic powder to be shaken into the shoes. If you have foot, aching feet, try Allen's Foot-Ease. It treats the feet and makes new or tight shoes easy. Cures itching, swollen, hot, sweating feet. Relieves corns and bunions of all pain and gives rest and comfort. Always use it to break in new shoes. Try it today. Sold everywhere. 25 cts. Don't accept an inferior. Five dollar trial package, address Allen S. Ousted, 16 Boy, N. Y.

Woman Makes Air Flight



The Princess Bleucher of Wahlstadt, the first Prussian woman to make an air flight. In spite of the serious injury to the Baroness de La Roche in France, the princess decided that the young air pilot give up the sport. The princess has made several successful flights and it is now reported that she will purchase a machine for herself.

MESSAGE OF GOVERNOR TO THE SOLONS.

(Continued from Page One.)

and the A. & M. college, if that can be done without resorting to a constitutional amendment.

Two Cent Fare Law.

The two cent fare law will be vigorously opposed by the members of the legislature from southwest Texas and the Panhandle section. They will take the grounds that those sections of the state need railroads much more than they do a lower railroad fare.

A Fredericksburg wants a road to San Antonio and to Austin. San Antonio wants a railroad to the Rio Grande. Amarillo wants a road south to the Gulf. Brady wants a road to connect with San Antonio. Aransas Pass wants a road west to Del Rio. The Orient is rapidly opening up the west.

Those who will fight the two cent fare law will declare that if the legislature would take such action that it would bring railroad building to a standstill and stop development. Julius Real, the only Republican senator in the state, will fight that law.

Lined up with Real will be many Democrats.

The two cent fare law is a pet hobby of governor Campbell.

The Message.

The first message of the governor to the special session of the legislature was as follows:

To the senate and house of representatives: In response to a popular demand and in obedience to what appeared to be the general desire of the legislature, this legislature, at its first called session, enacted and the executive approved the law contained in chapter 18 of the general laws of the 31st legislature and known as the fire-rating law.

At the time of the enactment of this law and for many years prior thereto there was a widespread and a well-founded dissatisfaction with general fire insurance companies, and especially with those companies which were organized in this state, and it was a matter of common knowledge that small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to pay higher rates of insurance than their more fortunate neighbors with large holdings. Under conditions then existing the fire insurance premiums were unfair, inequitable and affected adversely a majority of the individuals composing the insuring public. The assurances of benefits to accrue to the people under the law were not only a matter of common knowledge but small property owners were uniformly required to